

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 295 693

JC 880 247

AUTHOR Baratta, Frank; Apodaca, Ed C.
TITLE A Profile of California Community College Transfer Students at the University of California. [Revised].
INSTITUTION California Univ., Berkeley. Office of the President.
PUB DATE Feb 88
NOTE 56p.; This report contains tables with very small print.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Statistical Data (110)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Transfer Students; Community Colleges; *Enrollment Trends; Higher Education; State Surveys; *State Universities; *Student Characteristics
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted by the University of California (UC) to investigate trends in community college transfer rates between 1965 and 1987; institutional origins, characteristics, and first-year performance of transfer students; and student persistence and graduation rates. Study findings included the following: (1) between 1965 and the peak year of 1973 there was a 17% increase in transfer students, followed by a decline of 42% between 1973 and 1981, an increase of 11% between 1981 and 1983, and decrease of 8% between 1983 and 1986, and an increase of 12% between 1986 and 1987; (2) of the 106 community colleges in California, only 4 campuses sent 200 or more transfers to the UC; (3) of the 4,822 community college students who transferred to the UC with full records in 1985, 0.4% were American Indian, 1.9% were Black, 5.1% were Chicano, 3.2% were Latino, 1.2% were Pilipino, 14.6% were Asian, and 68.7% were White; (4) both male and female transfer students who entered the UC with upper-division standing preferred majors in the social and biological sciences; (5) fall 1985 regularly admitted transfers achieved a first-year grade point average of 2.76; and (6) third-year persistence and graduation rates for sophomore and junior transfers entering UC between fall 1982 and fall 1985 compared favorably with native UC students. (EJV)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED295693

A PROFILE OF CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
TRANSFER STUDENTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

FRANK BARATTA
ED C. APODACA

ADMISSIONS AND OUTREACH SERVICES
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

F. Baratta

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FEBRUARY 1988

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

AC 880 247

CONTENTS

A PROFILE OF CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRANSFER STUDENTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Introduction.....	1
Community College Transfer Trends.....	2
Origins of Transfers.....	4
Characteristics of Transfers:	
Admit Status, Ethnicity, and Gender.....	8
Admittted Transfers Who Did Not Enroll.....	10
Eligibility Trends.....	10
Entering Grade-Point Average.....	15
Majors.....	17
First-Year Performance.....	17
Persistence and Graduation Rates.....	22
Summary.....	28
References.....	31
Appendix A: Fall 1986 New Undergraduate Transfers.....	32
Appendix B: Academic Performance of Community College Transfers, Transfers from Four-Year Institutions, and Native Students.....	34
Appendix C: Corrected Figures for 1984 Report on Community College Transfers to the University.....	41

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE

1	Number of Community College Students Who Transferred to the University During the Fall, 1965-87.....	3
2	Transfers to UC and CSU as a Percentage of High School Graduates Entering Community Colleges Two Years Earlier..	3
3	Select Statistics on Community Colleges.....	5
4	Top Ten California Community College Feeder Campuses to the University, Fall 1986.....	5
5	Top Ten California Community College Feeder Districts to the University, Fall 1986	6
6	Number of Community College Transfers to Each University of California Campus, Fall 1979-1987.....	7
7	Community College Transfer Students to the University, Fall 1983 and Fall 1985.....	9
8	Ethnic Distribution of Community College 1984 First-Time Freshmen and Fall 1986 Transfer Students to the University.....	9
9	Summary of Community College Transfers: Admitted, Enrolled, and No Shows, Fall 1986.....	11
10	High School Graduation Levels of Eligibility for Fall 1985 Community College Transfers.....	12
11	Grade-Point Average of Community College Transfers by Entering Units Passed, Fall 1985.....	14
12	Percent of New Upper Division Transfer Students to the University from California Community Colleges by University Discipline, Fall 1984-85.....	16
13	Percent of Community College Transfer Students Achieving Different First-Year Grade Point Levels at the University, Fall 1985.....	18
14	Comparison of the 1985-86 Academic Performance of Regularly Admitted Fall 1985 Community College Transfers with Cohorts Who Transferred from Four-Year Institutions and Native Freshmen Who Became Juniors Fall 1982.....	18
15	Comparison of the 1985-86 Academic Performance of Regularly Admitted Fall 1985 Community College Transfers with Cohorts Who Transferred from Four-Year Institutions and Native Freshmen Who Became Juniors Fall 1982, Non-SAA Students.....	20

LIST OF TABLES (CON'T)

Tables

16	Comparison of the 1985-86 Academic Performance of Regularly Admitted Fall 1985 Community College Transfers with Cohorts Who Transferred from Four-Year Institutions and Native Freshmen Who Became Juniors Fall 1982, SAA Students.....	21
17	University of California Persistence and Graduation Rates for Community College Transfers Admitted as Regular Sophomore, Fall 1982-85.....	23
18	University of California Persistence and Graduation Rates for Community College Transfers Admitted as Special Action Sophomore, Fall 1982-85.....	24
19	University of California Persistence and Graduation Rates for Community College Transfers Admitted as Regular Junior, Fall 1982-85.....	26
20	University of California Persistence and Graduation Rates for Community College Transfers Admitted as Special Action Junior, Fall 1982-85.....	27

A PROFILE OF CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRANSFER STUDENTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

INTRODUCTION

Since 1975 there has been a growing interest in the number of Community College transfers to the University and the California State University system, and in the academic performance of these transfers. The Legislature, the segments of higher education, and representatives of the public sector have joined forces to increase their understanding of the factors which deter students from transferring into four-year programs. Accordingly, the University has been reexamining, for some time now, the effectiveness of its role in supporting the transfer function and evaluating statistics on transfer students. Thus far, three reports commenting on this review have been completed by the Office of the President, University of California (1-3). This one updates and expands on a previous study of Community College transfers to the University which was conducted by the Admissions and Outreach Services unit in 1984 (3).

As was true of previous studies, this report was guided by various concerns, including:

1. the continuing decline in the number of Community College students transferring to the University;
2. the relatively small number of Community Colleges from which these students transfer;
3. the level of academic preparation attained by transfer students; and
4. the academic performance and persistence at the University of Community College transfers in comparison to that of native cohorts at the University and of cohorts who transferred to the University from other two- or four-year colleges.

Statistical data* reported here have been organized into five topical areas: (1) Community College Transfer Trends, 1965-87; (2) Origins of Transfers; (3) Characteristics of Transfers; (4) First-Year Performance; and (5) Persistence and Graduation Rates.

* Unless otherwise noted, these data are for fall term transfers. The number of transfer for the winter and spring terms average about 25% of the fall total. The University, as well as the California State University, has begun updating the tables to be presented here with full year data. Future reports will reflect this enhancement.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRANSFER TRENDS, 1965-87

As can be seen in Table 1, there are five intervals within the 1965-87 period which describe alternating increases and decreases in the number of Community College transfers to the University. Between 1965 and the peak year of 1973, there was an increase of 178% of such students; between 1973 and 1981, the number of transfers declined by 42%; between 1981 and 1983 there was an increase of 11%; between 1983 and 1986 transfers declined by 8%. Third-week figures for Fall 1987 indicate a 12% increase between 1986 and 1987.

While there has been a decrease in the number of Community College students who transfer, there has been an increase in the percent of high school graduates who enter the Community Colleges and who subsequently enter the University or the California State University. (See Table 2.) Between 1982-87, for example, this percentage increased by 4.9 %. This increase occurred even though there was a substantial drop in the number of high school graduates who entered the Community Colleges during this period.

The varying number of transfers to the University no doubt reflects the complex interaction of various factors, with the contribution of each varying across time. Several conditions are frequently cited as contributing to this variation, including: the smaller number of students graduating from high school; the increase in the number of high school graduates who enroll directly into four-year institutions; increasing economic constraints which lead students to postpone their academic careers; and the poor communication between the Community Colleges and four-year institutions with respect to what constitutes transferrable course work, preparation needed for transfer, and admission requirements into specific programs and campuses.

It should be noted that the decline between 1973 and 1981 occurred in spite of an experiment by the University between 1973 and 1979 to relax its admissions requirements for transfers. This project, the Increased Accommodation of Transfer Students (IATS) project, allowed students to transfer from the Community Colleges with 2.0 grade point average, rather than the traditional 2.4, and to waive the requirement that students correct high school subject deficiencies before transferring. Thus the decline in the number of transfers during this time could have been greater had the IATS experiment not been in effect.

As one might expect, the number of students transferring from a particular Community College to a specific University campus has also varied over the last twenty years. A study by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) reports that there are no clear explanations why some campuses from the segments have shown increases in the number of transfers while

TABLE 1
NUMBER OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENTS
WHO TRANSFERRED TO THE UNIVERSITY
DURING THE FALL, 1965-87

1965-69		1970-74		1975-79		1980-84		1985-87	
1965	2,948	1970	5,166	1975	8,002	1980	5,428	1985	4,931
1966	3,761	1971	6,154	1976	7,123	1981	4,778	1986	4,858
1967	3,702	1972	7,165	1977	6,392	1982	5,137	1987	5,462
1968	3,785	1973	8,193	1978	6,193	1983	5,305		
1969	4,458	1974	7,813	1979	5,659	1984	5,257		

Source: California Postsecondary Education Commission: Fall 1986 Update of Community College Transfer Students Statistics. Commission Report 87-22, April 1987.

TABLE 2
TRANSFERS TO UC AND CSU AS A PERCENTAGE OF HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES
ENTERING COMMUNITY COLLEGES TWO YEARS EARLIER
1970-87

YEAR	% OF H.S. GRADS COMMUNITY COLLEGE	# OF H.S. GRADS TO COMMUNITY COLLEGES	TOTAL TRANSFERS	TOTAL AS A % OF H.S. GRADS ENTERING CC 2 YEARS EARLIER
1970-71	46.0%	129,358	34,225	—
1971-72	45.6%	128,918	38,700	—
1972-73	41.8%	122,043	41,784	32.3%
1973-74	41.3%	119,046	41,282	32.0%
1974-75	41.3%	119,652	40,459	33.2%
1975-76	43.1%	126,688	43,539	36.6%
1976-77	41.7%	120,702	39,776	33.2%
1977-78	43.3%	123,561	40,393	31.9%
1978-79	41.4%	117,510	37,802	31.3%
1979-80	42.1%	117,269	36,077	29.2%
1980-81	43.0%	116,518	35,918	30.6%
1981-82	42.1%	109,556	34,804	29.7%
1982-83	42.8%	113,815	34,961	30.0%
1983-84	37.9%	99,359	35,579	32.5%
1984-85	36.3%	93,521	35,391	31.1%
1985-86	33.0%	82,877	34,613	34.8%
1986-87	—	—	32,619	34.9%

Source: California Postsecondary Education Commission: Fall 1986 Update of Community College Transfer Students Statistics. Commission Report 87-22, April 1987.

others have shown a decline. As noted in the previous report by the Admission and Outreach Services unit, various factors are suspected, including the educational direction of the campuses, the availability of counseling, demographic shifts, economic concerns, and the effectiveness of articulation programs between specific campuses of the segments.

ORIGINS OF TRANSFERS

There were 30,456 new undergraduates at the University Fall 1986. Of this total, 22.7% (6,922) were advance standing transfers and of this group 70.2% (4,858) were from the Community Colleges. As mentioned, Community College campuses vary in terms of the number of transfers they send to the segments. Of the 106 Community College campuses, only 4 (3.8%) campuses sent 200 or more transfers which accounted for 19.1% of all Community College transfers to the University, and 14 (13.2%) sent 100 or more which accounted for 45.8%. (See Table 3.)

As can be seen in Tables 3 and 4, four individual Community Colleges distinguished themselves by sending 200 or more transfers to the University. These were Santa Monica (252), Diablo Valley (241), Santa Barbara (227), and Orange Coast (207). They are the same Community Colleges which were reported to have sent 200 or more students to the University in the 1984 study. Since Fall 1983, Santa Monica has increased its number of transfers to the University by 17.8% and Diablo Valley by 13.2%. Given that 68.9% of Community Colleges sent 50 students or less to the University, the performance of these four campuses is notable.

Several factors are frequently mentioned as contributing to the continued success of these four campuses in sending relatively large number of transfers to the University. They reside in middle to high socioeconomic areas; their surroundings, facilities, and academic reputations attract not only competent teachers but also well prepared students, many from outside the district; they have well-developed, long-standing transfer programs with nearby University campuses; and their students, who tend to be older and more settled in the surrounding community, prefer to enroll at nearby University campuses to complete their baccalaureate goals. In the case of Diablo Valley and Santa Barbara, the nearby University campuses also benefit from the absence of California State University campuses in their districts.

The top ten Community College districts, ranked in terms of the number of students transferring to the University, continue to be mostly from Southern California. (See Table 5.) The Coast and Los Angeles districts are in first and second place, respectively. These districts have been in the top two positions since 1979, and this very likely is attributable to the fact that these districts represent the campuses with the largest number of students among Community College districts.

TABLE 3
SELECT STATISTICS ON COMMUNITY COLLEGES
FALL 1986

Number of CC Campuses Involved	Range of Students Sent	Number of Transfers to the University	Percent of Total Transfers to the University
4	200 and above	929	19.1
1	150-199	151	3.1
9	100-14	1,145	23.6
5	75-99	441	9.1
14	50-74	902	18.6
21	25-49	715	14.7
51	1-24	575	11.8
1	0	0	0.
(106)		(4,858)	(100.0)

Source: Office of the President, Admissions and Outreach files,
February 1987.

TABLE 4
TOP TEN
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
FEEDER CAMPUSES TO THE UNIVERSITY
FALL 1986

CC CAMPUS	AI	Bl	Chc	Lat	Fil	Asn	Wht	Decl	Total
1) Santa Monica	2	14	4	10	1	36	170	15	252
2) Diablo Valley	2	6	8	6	0	14	190	15	241
3) Santa Barbara	1	1	10	4	4	15	180	12	227
4) Orange Coast	2	2	2	6	1	28	152	14	207
5) Cabrillo College	0	0	5	4	3	4	127	8	151
6) El Camino	2	6	7	14	1	30	76	7	143
7) De Anza	0	1	1	3	4	38	86	6	139
8) San Diego Mesa	1	4	7	3	2	23	93	5	138
9) America River	2	4	5	3	3	10	102	3	132
10) Saddleback	3	0	3	3	1	10	105	7	132
Total	(15)	(38)	(52)	(56)	(20)	(208)	(1,281)	(92)	(1,762)
(%)	(.8)	(2.2)	(3.0)	(3.2)	(1.1)	(11.8)	(72.7)	(5.2)	(100.0)

TABLE 5
TOP TEN
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
FEEDER DISTRICTS TO THE UNIVERSITY
FALL 1986

CC CAMPUS	AI	Bl	Chc	Lat	Fil	Asn	Wht	Decl	Total
1) Coast	2	2	4	10	2	41	199	170	278
2) LA	1	20	26	22	8	61	125	4	267
3) Foothill DeAnza	0	4	3	5	5	61	165	11	254
4) Santa Monica	2	14	4	10	1	36	170	15	252
5) Contra Costa	2	6	9	6	0	15	195	16	249
6) Los Rios	2	10	11	4	4	38	168	5	242
7) Santa Barbara	1	1	10	4	4	15	180	12	227
8) San Diego	1	9	10	3	5	29	117	8	182
9) Saddleback	4	1	6	3	1	10	124	8	157
10) Cabrillo	0	0	5	4	3	4	127	8	151
Total	(15)	(67)	(88)	(71)	(33)	(310)	(1,570)	(105)	(2,259)
(%)	(.7)	(3.0)	(3.9)	(3.1)	(1.5)	(13.7)	(69.5)	(4.6)	(100.0)

Source: Office of the President, Admissions and Outreach files, Fall 1986.

The majority of transfers come from Southern California and tend to enroll at University campuses close to their residence. (See Appendix A.) With one exception, transfers from the top ten Community College campuses enrolled at nearby University campuses: most Santa Monica students transferred to UCLA, Diablo Valley students went mostly to UCB, Santa Barbara students showed a preference for UCSB, and so on.

The one exception is De Anza which sent the largest number of transfers to UCSB and a substantial number to UCB. This distribution of transfers may reflect several factors. Many students who enrolled at De Anza come from various parts of Northern California. The geographic distribution of their residences is believed to be greater than that of students at other Community Colleges in the region. Many of its students tend to come from affluent families, and they have the resources and options to enroll at many more University campuses than their counterparts elsewhere. A substantial number of De Anza

TABLE 5
TOP TEN
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
FEEDER DISTRICTS TO THE UNIVERSITY
FALL 1986

CC CAMPUS	AI	BI	Chc	Lat	Fil	Asn	Wht	Decl	Total
1) Coast	2	2	4	10	2	41	199	170	278
2) LA	1	20	26	22	8	61	125	4	267
3) Foothill DeAnza	0	4	3	5	5	61	165	11	254
4) Santa Monica	2	14	4	10	1	36	170	15	252
5) Contra Costa	2	6	9	6	0	15	195	16	249
6) Los Rios	2	10	11	4	4	38	168	5	242
7) Santa Barbara	1	1	10	4	4	15	180	12	227
8) San Diego	1	9	10	3	5	29	117	8	182
9) Saddleback	4	1	6	3	1	10	124	8	157
10) Cabrillo	0	0	5	4	3	4	127	8	151
Total	(15)	(67)	(88)	(71)	(33)	(310)	(1,570)	(105)	(2,259)
(%)	(.7)	(3.0)	(3.9)	(3.1)	(1.5)	(13.7)	(69.5)	(4.6)	(100.0)

Source: Office of the President, Admissions and Outreach files, Fall 1986.

The majority of transfers come from Southern California and tend to enroll at University campuses close to their residence. (See Appendix A.) With one exception, transfers from the top ten Community College campuses enrolled at nearby University campuses: most Santa Monica students transferred to UCLA, Diablo Valley students went mostly to UCB, Santa Barbara students showed a preference for UCSB, and so on.

The one exception is De Anza which sent the largest number of transfers to UCSB and a substantial number to UCB. This distribution of transfers may reflect several factors. Many students who enrolled at De Anza come from various parts of Northern California. The geographic distribution of their residences is believed to be greater than that of students at other Community Colleges in the region. Many of its students tend to come from affluent families, and they have the resources and options to enroll at many more University campuses than their counterparts elsewhere. A substantial number of De Anza

TABLE 6
NUMBER OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRANSFERS TO
EACH UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA CAMPUS
Fall 1979 - 1987

Campus	Fall 1979	Fall 1980	Fall 1981	Fall 1982	Fall 1983	Fall 1984	Fall 1985	Fall 1986	Fall 1987
Berkeley	1,115	1,060	793	854	910	897	816	795	1,137
Davis	792	797	637	691	714	829	708	617	779
Irvine	522	591	541	503	573	555	553	611	629
Los Angeles	1,198	1,068	996	1,041	1,038	896	933	915	1,041
Riverside	255	228	213	250	205	234	252	226	228
San Diego	404	341	388	432	462	463	472	488	510
Santa Barbara	1,021	911	833	968	972	954	804	810	761
Santa Cruz	342	432	377	398	431	429	393	396	381
Total	5,649	5,428	4,778	5,137	5,305	5,257	4,931	4,858	5,462

Source: California Postsecondary Education Commission: Fall 1986 Update of Community College Transfer Students Statistics. Commission Report 87-22, April 1987.

transfers have career interests in engineering, computer sciences, and other over-subscribed fields. To assure their acceptance into the University, many students apply to various campuses. It should be noted that the majority of De Anza transfers to four-year institutions do enroll at a nearby campus, namely, San Jose State University.

Since 1981, the three top choices of Community College transfers have been Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara, and the two least preferred campuses have been Riverside and Santa Cruz (see Table 6). Between Fall 1983 and Fall 1986, three campuses showed an increase in the number and percent of transfers they enrolled: Riverside (10.2%), Irvine (6.6%), and San Diego (5.6%); three campuses showed a decrease: Davis (13.6%), Berkeley (12.6%), and Los Angeles (11.8%).

As displayed in Table 3, 73 campuses of the Community Colleges sent 49 or fewer transfers to the University. Many of these campuses have had difficulty over the years in consistently offering the full range of courses which potential transfers need to take to meet University requirements. One report (3) by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC), speculates that small or financially burdened Community Colleges encounter greater difficulty financing extensive transfer programs for students with diverse interests, given the differing requirements of the various University campuses and the large number of majors in which transfers may enroll.

Enrollment data from the Community Colleges and from the University for Fall 1986 transfers continue to suggest that Community College campuses with relatively high concentrations of underrepresented minorities (i.e., Hispanics, Blacks, Filipinos, and American Indians) tend to have fewer students who transfer to the University. Additionally, the ethnic type and number of transfers which the Community Colleges send are not proportional to their size in the campus population. For

example, one Community College campus, which had a 77% minority enrollment Fall 1981 among its first-time freshmen and a student body of about 1400, sent 88 students to the University in the Fall of 1983: of these, 32% were Asian and 30% were White, although their campus representation was 10% and 13% respectively.

On the other hand, many Community College campuses where the proportion of minorities is relatively small often send large numbers of these students to the University. One campus, for instance, sent 251 underrepresented minority students to the University although these students constituted only 13% of its student body. Thus efforts to improve on the number of minority transfers should not be focused entirely on Community College campuses with the highest percentage of minorities.

CHARACTERISTICS OF TRANSFERS

Discussion of transfer characteristics are organized into five sections: Admit Status, Ethnicity, and Gender; Admitted Transfers Who Did Not Enroll; Eligibility Trends; Entering Grade-Point Average; and Majors.

Admit Status, Ethnicity, and Gender

There were 4,822 Fall 1985 Community College students who transferred to the University with complete records. (See Table 7.) Eighty-four percent (4,053) entered as Regular Admits; of these 0.4% were American Indian, 1.9% were Black, 5.1% were Chicano, 3.2% were Latino, 1.2% were Pilipino, 14.6% were Asian, and 68.7% were White. Among those who entered as Special Action (769), 3.0% were American Indian, 9.5% were Black, 14.7% were Chicano, 5.7% were Latino, 7.2% were Pilipino, 7.4% were Asian, and 54.1% were White. More male than female students enrolled at both the Regular Admit (52.4% vs. 47.6%) and Special Action (51.4% vs. 48.6%) levels.

From Fall 1983 to Fall 1985, the percent of underrepresented minorities who entered as Regular Admits increased by 1.3%, Asians by 1.1%; Whites, on the other hand, decreased by 4.2%. For this same period of time, the percent of underrepresented minorities who entered as Special Action increased by 6.1%, Asians by .8%, and Whites decreased by 2.9%. The proportion of male and female transfers entering as Regular Admits stayed about the same for this period of time; however, among Special Action transfers, there was a slight increase of 2% in the proportion of female students.

Hispanic, Black, Pilipino, and American Indian students from the Community Colleges continue to be underrepresented at the University, whereas the opposite is the case for Asian and White transfers. "Underrepresented students" is defined here to mean those students whose representation among transfer students is not proportional to their size in the first-time freshmen

TABLE 7
COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRANSFER STUDENTS
TO THE UNIVERSITY

Admit Status/ Gender	American Indian	Black	Chicano	Latino	Pilipino	Asian	White/ Other	Declined To State	Total
<u>FALL 1985</u>									
Regular (n)	(17)	(77)	(207)	(129)	(48)	(593)	(2784)	(111)	(4053)
Female	58.8	51.9	49.3	49.6	52.1	39.5	49.3	36.9	47.6
Male	41.2	48.1	50.7	50.4	47.9	60.5	50.7	63.1	52.4
Special Action (n)	(23)	(73)	(113)	(44)	(55)	(57)	(416)	(9)	(769)
Female	39.1	56.2	46.0	54.5	44.0	38.6	49.8	33.3	48.6
Male	60.9	43.8	54.0	45.5	56.0	61.4	50.2	66.7	51.4
<u>FALL 1986</u>									
Regular (n)	(28)	(95)	(188)	(121)	(40)	(610)	(3280)	(137)	(4499)
Female	53.6	52.6	45.7	52.1	32.5	42.3	48.9	50.4	47.9
Male	46.4	47.4	54.3	47.9	67.5	57.7	51.1	49.6	52.1
Special Action (n)	(15)	(110)	(105)	(25)	(11)	(52)	(446)	(19)	(783)
Female	46.7	48.2	46.7	48.0	45.5	32.7	48.2	36.8	46.6
Male	53.3	51.8	53.3	52.0	54.5	67.3	51.8	63.2	53.4

Source: Office of the President, Admissions and Outreach files, November 1987.

TABLE 8
ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE FALL 1984
FIRST-TIME FRESHMEN AND FALL 1986 TRANSFER
STUDENTS TO THE UNIVERSITY

Community College	Total Number	Ethnicity						
		American Indian	Asian	Pilipino	Black	Hispanic	White	Unknown
Freshmen ¹	81,339	1.5	6.0	2.4	9.3	16.1	64.7	2.2
Transfers ²	4,858	0.9	13.7	2.0	3.0	10.0	69.5	4.4

¹California Postsecondary Education Commission. California College-Going Rates: 1984 Update. Commission Report 85-34, September 1985.

²California Postsecondary Education Commission. Fall 1986 Update of Community College Transfer Student Statistics. Commission Report 87-22, April 1987.

population at the Community Colleges two years earlier. As can be seen in Table 8, among Fall 1986 transfers, Hispanics were underrepresented by 6.1%, Blacks by 6.3%, Pilipinos by .4%, and American Indians by .6%, whereas Asians were overrepresented by 7.7%, and Whites by 4.8%.

Comparisons with similar Fall 1983 figures reported in the last study by Admissions and Outreach, reveal relatively small but positive increases in minority representation. Relative to their proportion among Fall 1983 transfers, Hispanics increased by 1.1%, and Pilipinos by 1.0%, while the percent of American Indians remained the same. The increase for Hispanics and the stability of American Indian figures are noteworthy because these occurred in spite of the fact that there was a decrease of their proportion in the Community Colleges: .5% for American Indians and .6% for Hispanics. The increase for Pilipinos brings them close to achieving parity.

Admitted Transfers Who Did Not Enroll

There were 8,424 students from the Community Colleges who were admitted for Fall 1986, 43% (3,653) of which did not enroll. (See Table 9.) Relative to Fall 1983 levels which were reported in the last study by Admissions and Outreach, this represents a 29.1% (1,897) increase in the number of admitted students and 200% increase in the number of no shows. Among this latter group, 13% (473) were Hispanic, Black, Pilipino, or American Indian; this is comparable to what was observed for the Fall 1983 entrants from these groups. A survey by the Admissions and Outreach Services and recent discussions held at the University's Counselor Conferences suggests that many of these admitted students may not be enrolling for several reasons: the perceived impersonal manner in which students are recruited and applications are processed; lateness of notification from Admissions, Financial Aid, and/or Housing Offices; misperceptions about financial aid programs and eligibility requirements; a student's need to work, and difficulty in finding acceptable housing around the University's most populated campuses.

As is known, there has been an increase in the number of applications to the University which has created serious problems for entering freshmen. There has been no such problem for most eligible advanced standing applicants. On occasion some of these students who apply to impacted programs (e.g., Engineering, Information Sciences) do not get their campus of choice because of the relatively few positions that are available in their major. Such students are given the choice of selecting an alternate major on their preferred campus or of pursuing their initial career choice at an alternative campus. Most eligible advanced standing transfers, however, are admitted to the campus and major of their first choice.

Eligibility Trends

In the Fall of 1985, 24.6% of Regularly Admitted Community College transfers were also regularly admissable upon high school graduation. (See Table 10.) This is a 7.0% decline from Fall

TABLE 9
SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRANSFERS
ADMITTED, ENROLLED AND NO SHOWS
FALL 1986

LEVEL	ETHNICITY	REGULAR ADMITTED	REGULAR ENROLLED	REGULAR NO SHOWS	SPACTION ADMITTED	SPACTION ENROLLED	SPACTION NO SHOWS	TOTAL ADMITTED	TOTAL ENROLLED	TOTAL NO SHOWS
FRESHMEN	AM IND	10	5	5	1	1	0	11	6	5
	ASIAN	92	34	58	6	6	0	98	40	58
	BLACK	24	6	18	11	9	2	35	15	20
	CHICANO	32	10	22	4	4	0	36	14	22
	LATINO	26	5	21	8	5	3	34	10	24
	PILIPINO	21	8	13	3	2	1	24	10	14
	WHITE	535	192	343	30	28	2	565	220	345
	DECLINE	29	9	20	3	2	1	32	11	21
SUB-TOTAL		(769)	(296)	(500)	(66)	(57)	(9)	(835)	(326)	(509)
SOPHOMORE	AM IND	6	4	2	11	8	3	17	12	5
	ASIAN	123	73	50	22	20	2	145	93	52
	BLACK	25	15	10	38	33	5	63	48	15
	CHICANO	49	23	26	58	45	13	107	68	39
	LATINO	23	14	7	24	22	2	47	36	9
	PILIPINO	15	11	4	6	4	2	21	15	6
	WHITE	910	521	389	162	149	13	1072	670	402
	DECLINE	59	28	31	15	15	0	74	43	31
SUB-TOTAL		(1210)	(691)	(519)	(336)	(296)	(40)	(1546)	(987)	(559)
JUNIOR	AM IND	35	15	20	10	9	1	45	24	21
	ASIAN	1017	497	520	24	21	3	1041	518	523
	BLACK	109	67	42	38	30	8	147	97	50
	CHICANO	249	129	120	48	42	6	297	171	126
	LATINO	176	109	67	27	23	4	203	132	71
	PILIPINO	84	43	41	10	10	0	94	53	41
	WHITE	3617	2071	1546	184	159	25	3801	2230	1571
	DECLINE	321	176	145	17	13	4	338	189	149
SUB-TOTAL		(5608)	(3107)	(2501)	(358)	(307)	(51)	(5966)	(3414)	(2552)
SENIOR	AM IND	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
	ASIAN	8	4	4	0	0	0	8	4	4
	BLACK	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	CHICANO	8	5	3	0	0	0	8	5	3
	LATINO	2	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	2
	PILIPINO	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
	WHITE	51	30	21	3	2	1	54	32	22
	DECLINE	3	1	2	0	0	0	3	1	2
SUB-TOTAL		(74)	(42)	(32)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(77)	(4)	(33)
SYSTEMWIDE	AM IND	52	25	27	22	18	4	74	43	31
	ASIAN	1240	608	632	52	47	5	1292	655	637
	BLACK	158	88	70	87	72	15	245	140	85
	CHICANO	338	167	171	110	91	19	448	258	190
	DECLINE	412	214	198	35	30	5	447	244	203
	LATINO	227	130	97	59	50	9	286	180	106
	PILIPINO	121	63	58	19	16	3	140	79	61
	WHITE	5113	2814	2299	379	338	41	5492	3152	2340
TOTAL		7661	4109	3552	763	662	101	8424	4771	3653

Source: Office of the President, Admissions and Outreach files, November 1987.

TABLE 10
LEVELS OF ELIGIBILITY UPON THEIR HIGH SCHOOL
GRADUATION AND ADMIT STATUS OF ETHNICITY

FALL 1985

ADMIT STATUS/ HIGH SCHOOL ELIG STATUS	AMR IND (A)	BLACK (B)	CHI- CANO (C)	LATINO (D)	PILI- PINO (E)	SAA (A-E)	ASIAN (F)	WHITE (G)	MORESP (H)	NON- SAA (F-N)	TOTAL (A-N)
REGULAR ADMIT (n)	(17)	(77)	(207)	(129)	(48)	(478)	(593)	(2784)	(198)	(3575)	(4053)
A. Regularly Admissible	23.5	16.9	28.5	29.5	37.5	27.6	20.2	25.2	19.8	24.2	24.6
B. Elig. Only From Tests (CEEB ELIG>)	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.3	.5	.9	.5	.4
C. Scholar Def/Elig. Index < 242.5	11.8	9.1	9.7	10.1	8.3	9.6	9.3	9.1	8.1	9.1	9.1
D. Subject Deficiency	.0	9.1	10.1	9.3	10.4	9.4	15.3	13.0	9.0	13.3	12.8
E. Scholarship/Subject Deficiency	64.7	61.0	48.3	46.5	37.5	49.4	42.7	47.7	54.1	47.0	47.3
F. No Test or Wrong Pattern	.0	1.3	1.4	.8	4.2	1.5	1.3	1.9	3.6	1.9	1.9
G. High School Not Approved	.0	1.3	.5	1.0	.0	.4	1.5	.4	.0	.6	.5
H. Not a High School Graduate	.0	.0	.5	1.6	.0	1.6	7.9	1.0	1.8	2.3	2.1
Not Applicable	.0	1.3	1.0	2.3	2.1	1.5	1.3	1.1	2.7	1.2	1.2
SPECIAL ACTION (n)	(23)	(73)	(113)	(44)	(25)	(278)	(57)	(416)	(18)	(491)	(769)
A. Regularly Admissible	.0	.0	1.8	4.5	8.0	2.2	1.8	1.2	.0	1.2	1.6
C. Scholar Def/Elig. Index < 242.5	4.3	8.2	12.4	25.0	16.0	12.9	12.3	12.5	.0	12.0	12.4
D. Subject Deficiency	17.4	2.7	4.4	2.3	.0	4.3	8.8	3.8	11.1	4.5	4.4
E. Scholarship/Subject Deficiency	69.6	84.9	77.9	63.6	68.0	75.9	43.9	79.1	66.7	75.2	75.4
F. No Test or Wrong Pattern	4.3	.0	.0	.0	.0	.4	.0	.5	.0	.4	.4
G. High School Not Approved	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.5	.0	.4	.3
H. Not a High School Graduate	4.3	1.4	.9	.0	.0	1.1	3.5	1.4	22.2	2.0	1.7
Not Applicable	.0	2.7	2.7	4.5	8.0	3.2	29.8	1.0	.0	4.3	3.9

Source: Office of the President, Admissions and Outreach files, November 1987.

1983 figures and a 13.6% decline from Fall 1981. Among the different Fall 1985 ethnic groups, Chicanos showed an increase of 1.6%, Latinos 1.8%, and Pilipinos 5.9% from 1983 levels. American Indians, on the other hand, showed a decrease of 15.8%, Blacks 1.0%, Asians 7.2%, and Whites 8%.

The decline in the percentage of transfer students eligible from high school is no doubt due to the well known change in the college enrollment pattern of recent high school graduates, namely, that a greater percent of high school graduates are entering the University or other four-year institutions directly. This change is not equally true for all ethnic groups, and the eligibility data presented reflects some group differences. The trends noted here are in the opposite direction of what was reported in the last transfer study. Specifically, these findings suggests that an increasing number of University eligible minorities are enrolling in the Community Colleges, whereas an increasing number of eligible Asians and Whites are opting to attend the University or other four-year institutions immediately after high school. The latter groups, of course, tend to have greater resources and less economic restraints than underrepresented minorities with respect to the postsecondary institutions they can attend. Minorities who attended Community Colleges very likely do so because of economic reasons: certainly not because they were turned away by the University since it is the practice of the University to admit eligible underrepresented students.

As is known, most minorities find the Community Colleges more accessible than other postsecondary educational alternatives. The "open door" admissions policy of the Community Colleges, their numerous vocational programs, and their relatively low admissions fee are key factors which make them attractive college choices to most minorities. In addition, minorities prefer campuses close to their homes as they often have family responsibilities and do not have the resources to move away for college. Many of these students who need to hold part-time jobs find the class schedules at Community College campuses more agreeable than those of other institutions, especially students needing to enroll on a part-time basis or to take evening classes.

Relative to Fall 1983 levels, the percentage of transfers showing "Subject Deficiency" upon high school graduation decreased overall by 1.2%. However, the percentage of records showing "Scholarship/Subject Deficiency" increased by 6.6% for all students, 32.6% for American Indians, 5.2% for Blacks, 3.6% for Latinos, 4.8 for Asians, and 7.9% for Whites; decreases of 4.9%, and 2.0% were observed for Chicanos and Pilipinos respectively. This finding supports the commonly held view that the majority of transfers are not ready for the University upon graduation from high school, and that they need to take corrective course work at a Community College before enrolling in four-year institutions. The percentage of Asians who transfer as Regular Admits and who had no record of high school graduation increased by 1.0% over Fall 1983. This statistic had been 6.9% since Fall 1981. As can be seen in Table 10, the majority of transfers without their high

TABLE 11
GRADE-POINT AVERAGE OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRANSFERS
BY ENTERING UNITS PASSED, ADMIT STATUS, AND ETHNICITY

FALL 1985

ADMIT STATUS/ ENTERING UNITS	AMR IND	BLACK	CHICANO	LATINO	PILIPINO	ASIAN	WHITE	NORESP	TOTAL
REGULAR ADMIT (n)	(17)	(77)	(207)	(129)	(48)	(593)	(2784)	(198)	(4053)
0-44	.00 (0)	3.05 (11)	3.22 (10)	3.09 (16)	2.70 (3)	3.21 (196)	2.93 (5)	3.22 (239)	3.21 (279)
45-89	3.05 (10)	2.98 (41)	3.06 (111)	3.11 (60)	3.20 (21)	3.32 (254)	3.18 (1453)	3.19 (60)	3.18 (2056)
90-134	3.01 (7)	2.87 (24)	3.06 (81)	3.07 (51)	3.04 (22)	3.24 (294)	3.21 (1062)	3.00 (44)	3.19 (1619)
Unknown	.00 (0)	.00 (0)	3.54 (1)	.00 (0)	.00 (0)	3.35 (1)	3.21 (19)	2.60 (1)	3.21 (22)
135-179	.00 (0)	2.68 (1)	2.69 (4)	3.34 (2)	3.62 (2)	3.29 (13)	3.06 (54)	2.85 (1)	3.10 (77)
SPECIAL ACTION (n)	(23)	(73)	(113)	(44)	(25)	(57)	(416)	(19)	(769)
0-44	2.94 (4)	2.79 (16)	2.78 (31)	3.07 (8)	2.64 (5)	3.02 (21)	3.12 (54)	.00 (0)	2.96 (139)
45-89	3.02 (13)	2.70 (45)	2.76 (60)	2.91 (31)	2.64 (19)	3.09 (23)	3.01 (289)	3.54 (8)	2.94 (495)
90-134	2.78 (6)	2.68 (12)	2.63 (20)	2.60 (4)	2.48 (1)	2.66 (12)	2.87 (67)	3.32 (1)	2.78 (125)
Unknown	.00 (0)	.00 (0)	.00 (0)	2.20 (1)	.00 (0)	.00 (0)	2.58 (2)	.00 (0)	2.45 (3)
135-179	.00 (0)	.00 (0)	2.63 (2)	.00 (0)	.00 (0)	2.41 (1)	2.39 (4)	.00 (0)	2.46 (7)

Source: Office of the President, Admission and Outreach files, November 1987.

school records are Asian. This condition may reflect the increase in the number of immigrants from Pacific-Rim countries seeking political asylum in California. Often these students cannot obtain their high school records from their country of origin.

Entering Grade-Point Average

Over the years, a student's grade point average (gpa) in transferable course work has proven to be a good predictor of academic performance at the University. For this reason, the campus admissions offices review carefully this achievement measure in the selection of transfer students. Several findings pertaining to the performance of Fall 1985 transfers at their respective source schools are noteworthy. In evaluating these findings, the varying number of cases on which they rest should be noted. The sample sizes for some groups are extremely small and do not lend themselves to reliable generalizations.

As can be seen in Table 11, of the 4,053 Regularly Admitted transfers for whom complete records were available, 1.9% (77) entered with 135-179 units, 40.0% (1,619) completed 90-134 units, 50.7% (2,056) entered 45-89 units, and 6.9% (279) completed 0-44 units. As was observed in the previous study, the majority of transfers entered with 45-89 units. The entering gpa for this group was .04 of a point less than that of Fall 1983 Regular Admit students who entered with a similar number of units; Blacks showed an increase of .03 gpa units, Chicanos .04, and Latino .02; American Indians showed a decrease of .05, Pilipinos .01, Asians .03, and Whites .04.

In Fall 1985, 769 transfers entered as Special Action admits, .9% (7) of this group entered with 135-179 units, 16.2% (125) completed 90-134 units, 64.4% (495) entered with 45-89 units, and 18.1% (139) completed 0-44 units. Once again, the majority of students transferring were those who had 45-89 units; this group entered with a gpa of 2.94 which was .03 gpa units less than what was achieved by the Fall 1983 Special Action students entering with similar units. American Indians in this group showed an increase of .21 gpa units, whereas Blacks entered with the same gpa. On the down side, Chicanos and Latinos had an entering gpa which was .06 units less, Pilipinos decreased by .36 gpa units, Asians by .26, and Whites by .02.

A fine-grain analysis of these gpa data revealed that they were based on a substantial number of transferable units attempted and passed each semester, and achieved by a class which had a significant number of entrants who were not regularly admissible after high school because of subject and scholarship deficiencies. These findings suggest that transfer students progress satisfactorily through their course work in preparing for the University, and that for some students the Community Colleges continue to provide the second chance envisioned by the authors of the Master Plan.

TABLE 12
PERCENT OF NEW UPPER DIVISION TRANSFER STUDENTS TO
THE UNIVERSITY FROM CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
BY UNIVERSITY DISCIPLINE

FALL 84-85

UC DISCIPLINE CODES*	FALL '84		FALL '85	
	MALES (n=2102)	FEMALES (n=1712)	MALES (n=1414)	FEMALES (n=1185)
Agriculture & Natural Resources	1.6	1.3	1.2	1.6
Agriculture & Environ Design	.8	.3	.8	.2
Area Studies	.1	.4	.1	.1
Biological Sciences	6.2	4.9	7.1	5.6
Business & Management	3.3	1.8	2.7	1.8
Computer & Information Sciences	2.0	1.2	1.4	.9
Education	.0	.1	.0	.0
Engineering	8.3	1.6	8.6	2.0
Fine & Applied Arts	2.3	3.1	1.8	3.3
Foreign Languages	.5	.9	1.8	1.0
General or Unclassified	6.8	4.9	11.9	8.9
Home Economics	.1	.6	.1	.8
Interdisciplinary Studies	2.0	3.7	1.3	2.8
Law	.1	.1	.0	.0
Letters	3.1	5.2	2.5	4.6
Mathematics	2.1	1.6	1.7	1.0
Nursing	.0	.2	.0	.3
Optometry	.0	.0	.0	.0
Physical Education	.2	.2	.0	.0
Physical Sciences	3.7	1.3	5.0	1.8
Psychology	1.6	3.9	.9	2.4
Social Sciences	10.2	7.6	6.8	6.0
Social Work & Helping Services	.1	.1	.0	.2

Source: Office of the President, Admission and Outreach files, University of California, November 1987.

*These codes are used by the campuses to classify student self-selected majors. The codes are part of the Academic Program Inventory established by the Office of Academic Planning and Program Review, Office of the President, University of California.

Majors

As can be seen on Table 12, both female and male transfer students who entered the University with upper division standing prefer majors in the social and biological sciences, and a significant percent of both genders have a general or unclassified status. The number of transfers who enroll in two of the most popular majors, business administration and engineering, reflects space limitations rather than student interest. Until recently, business administration was offered only at the Berkeley campus. It is now being offered by the Riverside and Santa Cruz campuses as well. The number of openings, however, are still very small. Engineering is the most oversubscribed major, and the competition for the limited spaces in this field is extremely high.

More men than women major in engineering, business and management, mathematics, computer and information sciences, and the physical sciences. Women, on the other hand, elect majors in letters, psychology, interdisciplinary studies, and fine and applied arts more so than men. These findings, of course, reflect prevailing cultural norms regarding gender-specific occupational choices as well as available space.

A few changes between Fall 1984 and 1985 entrants are worth noting. The percent of female and male transfers who elected majors in engineering, the biological and physical sciences has increased; whereas the percent who elect majors in computer and information sciences, interdisciplinary studies, mathematics, and the social sciences has decreased. The former reflects renewed efforts by the University to increase the number of women in majors traditionally oversubscribed by men; the latter may reflect the changing perceptions students have about the future potential of jobs in these areas. Education, law, nursing, optometry, physical education, and social work/helping services continue to be the least preferred disciplines. The relatively low rate of interest in these fields may also reflect the assessments students have made about the professional status and/or potential earning power in these fields.

It bears repeating that the number of transfers in a given discipline is determined, to a large extent, by the number of students who can be admitted relative to the spaces available at other colleges or universities. At the University, for example, a relatively small number of transfers elect majors in education, engineering, and business. This may reflect the preference of Community College transfers to pursue careers in these fields in the California State University system which accommodates many more students in these areas than does the University.

FIRST-YEAR PERFORMANCE

Fall 1985 regularly admitted transfers achieved a first-year grade point average of 2.76. (See Table 13.) Of this group, 38.6% achieved a gpa of 3.0 or better, 65.4% achieved a gpa of 2.5 or greater, and 86.3% achieved a gpa of 2.0 or higher.

TABLE 13

PERCENT OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRANSFER STUDENTS ACHIEVING DIFFERENT
FIRST-YEAR GRADE POINT LEVELS AT THE UNIVERSITY

FALL 1985

ADMIT STATUS/ GRADE PT LEVEL	AMR IND (A)	BLACK (B)	CHI- CANO (C)	LATINO (D)	PILI- PINO (E)	SAA (A-E) (F)	ASIAN (F)	WHITE (G)	NORESP (H)	TOTAL (A-H) (I)
REGULAR ADMIT (n)	(15)	(71)	(191)	(122)	(46)	(445)	(573)	(2523)	(95)	(3720)
3.5-4.0	6.7	1.4	4.7	4.9	6.5	4.5	14.5	15.9	14.7	14.1
3.0-3.49	26.7	14.1	15.7	27.9	19.6	19.6	25.5	25.1	22.1	24.5
2.5-2.99	26.7	31.0	29.8	27.9	30.4	29.4	26.2	26.7	24.2	26.8
2.0-2.49	33.3	14.9	28.3	17.2	28.3	23.6	19.9	20.4	22.1	20.9
0.0-1.99	6.7	36.6	21.5	22.1	15.2	22.9	14.0	11.9	16.8	13.7
*Average GPA	2.72	2.35	2.48	2.66	2.60	2.53	2.81	2.80	2.46	2.76
SPECIAL ACTION (n)	(22)	(71)	(104)	(41)	(24)	(262)	(56)	(381)	(8)	(716)
3.5-4.0	4.5	1.4	1.9	2.4	.0	1.9	8.9	11.0	12.5	7.4
3.0-3.49	18.2	7.0	8.7	19.5	12.5	11.1	14.3	19.7	30.0	16.8
2.5-2.99	27.3	23.9	30.8	17.1	20.8	25.6	3.2	28.9	37.5	27.1
2.0-2.49	18.2	33.8	27.9	29.3	12.5	27.5	35.7	23.9	.0	26.0
0.0-1.99	31.8	33.8	30.8	31.7	54.2	34.0	17.9	16.5	.0	22.8
*Average GPA	2.54	2.14	2.31	2.29	2.12	2.26	2.57	2.63	2.85	2.50

Source: Office of the President, Admissions and Outreach files, November 1987.

*Grade point averages are based on record of students who persisted through one or more terms during the 1985-86 academic year.

TABLE 14

COMPARISON OF THE 1985-86 ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF REGULARLY
ADMITTED FALL 1985 COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRANSFERS WITH
COHORTS WHO TRANSFERRED FROM FOUR-YEAR
INSTITUTIONS AND NATIVE FRESHMEN
WHO BECAME JUNIORS FALL 1982

Performance Level/ Units Completed as of Fall 1985	Fall 1983 Native Freshmen Who Became Juniors Fall 1982	Fall 1985 Junior Transfers from 4-Year Colleges		Fall 1985 Community College Junior Transfers	
		Eligible from High School	Ineligible High School	Eligible from High School	Ineligible High School
Lower Division GPA					
75-89.9 (n)	2.81 (4,450)	3.15 (44)	3.02 (47)	3.29 (84)	3.10 (561)
90-100 (n)	3.02 (2,632)	3.25 (54)	2.97 (78)	3.28 (111)	3.10 (557)
100.1-120 (n)	3.17 (1,708)	3.32 (36)	3.03 (85)	3.37 (151)	3.17 (634)
First-Year Upper Division GPA*					
75-89.9 (n)	2.92 (4,031)	3.08 (46)	2.69 (77)	2.87 (85)	2.65 (591)
(Average Units Taken)	(33.5)	(33.4)	(30.9)	(37.4)	(31.8)
90-100 (n)	3.09 (2,344)	3.03 (54)	2.79 (81)	2.88 (118)	2.75 (579)
(Average Units Taken)	(37.6)	(39.0)	(33.2)	(36.9)	(33.9)
100.1-120 (n)	3.21 (1,310)	3.16 (37)	2.89 (85)	3.04 (152)	2.84 (646)
(Average Units Taken)	(38.3)	(43.1)	(32.9)	(37.2)	(33.7)

Source: Office of the President, Admissions and Outreach files, November 1987.

*Based on records of students who persisted one or more terms during the 1985-86 academic year.

Differences among underrepresented minorities with respect to their first-year performance must be viewed tentatively given the relatively small number of cases for Chicano, Latino, Black, Pilipino, and American Indian students. There are noteworthy differences between these groups with respect to their first-year gpa. (See Table 13.) At the upper end of the scale, the percentage of Regular Admit students who were in the 3.0(B)-4.0(A) range was different for each underrepresented group, varying from 1.4% to 6.7%. At the lower end of the scale, the percentage of students who were in the 0.0(F)-2.0(C) range varied from 6.7% to 36.6%.

Fall 1985 Special Action Admits achieved a first-year gpa was 2.50. Of this group, 24.2% achieved a gpa of 3.0 or better, 51.3% achieved a gpa of 2.5 or greater, and 77.3% achieved a gpa of 2.0 or higher. The percentage of students who were in the 3.0(B)-4.0(A) range was different for each underrepresented group, varying from 0% to 4.5%; at the other extreme, the percentage of students performing in the 0.0(F)-2.0(C) range varied from 30.8% to 54.2%.

Lower division and first-year grade point averages (gpa's) of Fall 1985, regularly admitted transfers from Community Colleges and four-year institutions were compared with those of regularly admitted native University students who were beginning their junior year. The campuses frequently give students junior status even though they may have less than the 90 units required for this standing. Limiting this analysis to students who had completed 90 units or more would leave out a substantial number and give an unrepresentative picture. In order to involve the majority of students in this analysis, students were grouped into three classes: those who had completed 75-90 units prior to their third year of college, those who had completed 90-100, and those who had completed 100-120 units.

Table 14 summarizes the results of this analysis. As can be seen, native students achieved an upper division gpa that was higher than their lower division performance**, whereas the opposite was the case for transfers. The performance of native students in their junior year was also better than that of transfers, and the performance of transfers from 4-year institutions was better than that of Community College students. Regardless of their origins, almost all students performed at acceptable levels. These findings are similar to those reported by previous studies.

These differences would be expected, of course, since native students are refining their academic skills each year and relatedly are better able each year to deal with the demands of their course work. Transfers, on the other hand, enter the University with academic skills that have been shaped by the course work requirements of their previous institutions. Thus

** The previous study reported just the opposite of this trend. It was subsequently found to be in error. See Appendix C for corrected figures which are similar to those in Table 14.

TABLE 15

COMPARISON OF THE 1985-86 ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF REGULARLY
ADMITTED FALL 1985 COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRANSFERS WITH
COHORTS WHO TRANSFERRED FROM FOUR-YEAR
INSTITUTIONS AND NATIVE FRESHMEN
WHO BECAME JUNIORS FALL 1985
NON-SAA STUDENTS^a

Performance Level/ Units Completed as of Fall 1985	Fall 1983 Native Freshmen Who Became Juniors Fall 1985	Fall 1985 Junior Transfers from 4-Year Colleges		Fall 1985 Community College Junior Transfers	
		Eligible from High School	Ineligible High School	Eligible from High School	Ineligible High School
Lower Division GPA					
75-89.9 (n)	2.84 (3,881)	3.18 (39)	3.05 (65)	3.29 (71)	3.11 (491)
90-100 (n)	3.03 (2,448)	3.24 (51)	3.02 (67)	3.28 (103)	3.14 (478)
100.1-120 (n)	3.18 (1,593)	3.36 (33)	3.09 (68)	3.40 (131)	3.20 (551)
First-Year Upper Division GPA^b					
75-89.9 (n) (Average Units Taken)	2.94 (3,495) (35.6)	3.12 (39) (33.6)	2.70 (65) (30.7)	2.87 (71) (38.1)	2.68 (491) (31.8)
90-100 (n) (Average Units Taken)	3.11 (2,176) (37.6)	3.05 (51) (39.4)	2.86 (67) (34.9)	2.89 (103) (36.8)	2.80 (478) (34.2)
100.1-120 (n) (Average Units Taken)	3.22 (1,411) (38.3)	3.19 (33) (41.0)	2.95 (68) (33.9)	3.09 (131) (37.1)	2.89 (551) (33.8)

Source: Office of the President, Admissions and Outreach files, November 1987.

^aNon-SAA students are those who define themselves as "White, Asian, or Other."

^bBased on records of students who persisted one or more terms during the 1985-86 academic year.

TABLE 16

COMPARISON OF THE 1985-86 ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF REGULARLY
 ADMITTED FALL 1985 COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRANSFERS WITH
 COHORTS WHO TRANSFERRED FROM FOUR-YEAR
 INSTITUTIONS AND NATIVE FRESHMEN
 WHO BECAME JUNIORS FALL 1982
 SAA STUDENTS^a

Performance Level/ Units Completed as of Fall 1985	Fall 1983 Native Freshmen Who Became Juniors Fall 1985	Fall 1985 Junior Transfers from 4-Year Colleges		Fall 1985 Community College Junior Transfers	
		Eligible from High School	Ineligible High School	Eligible from High School	Ineligible High School
Lower Division GPA					
75-89.9 (n)	2.65 (569)	2.85 (5)	2.82 (9)	3.28 (13)	2.97 (70)
90-100 (n)	2.88 (184)	3.41 (3)	2.63 (11)	3.28 (8)	2.90 (79)
100.1-120 (n)	2.99 (115)	2.90 (3)	2.78 (17)	3.14 (20)	2.97 (83)
First-Year Upper Division GPA^b					
75-89.9 (n) (Average Units Taken)	2.72 (536) (34.9)	2.71 (5) (31.6)	2.58 (9) (32.8)	2.85 (13) (33.6)	2.45 (70) (31.6)
90-100 (n) (Average Units Taken)	2.93 (172) (37.2)	2.63 (3) (32.0)	2.09 (11) (22.3)	2.76 (8) (37.8)	2.40 (79) (31.8)
100.1-120 (n) (Average Units Taken)	3.05 (99) (38.8)	2.98 (3) (67.4)	2.58 (17) (28.5)	2.68 (20) (37.8)	2.53 (83) (33.0)

Source: Office of the President, Admissions and Outreach files, November 1987.

^aSAA students are those who define themselves as "Chicano, Latino, Black, Pilipino or America Indian."

^bBased on records of students who persisted one or more terms during the 1985-86 academic year.

they frequently experience an adjustment period in adapting to the University's curriculum requirements and in the interim may not perform as well as they once did. This adjustment would be expected to be more difficult for transfers from the Community Colleges than from 4-year institutions because the curriculum of the latter is more similar to that of the University. Future analyses of this sort should include second- and third-year grade information to determine whether or not transfers ever regain the performance level with which they enter.

The first-year University performance of transfers was once again found to vary with a student's eligibility status. Transfers who were eligible to the University upon graduation from high school performed better during their first year than transfers who did not have this standing. This was found to be true for transfers from 4-year institutions and from the Community Colleges.

Performance data for both native students and transfers from different ethnic groups revealed similar findings. Inter-group differences were also observed. As can be seen on Tables 15 and 16, non-SAA transfers (those who identified themselves as "White, Asian, or Other") generally performed better than SAA transfers (those who identified themselves as "Chicano, Latino, Black, Pilipino, or American Indian"). More specific group comparisons revealed that, Whites performed slightly better than Asians, and both of these groups performed better than other ethnic groups. Among native students, Latinos performed slightly better than Pilipinos, Pilipinos better than Chicanos, and Chicanos better than Blacks. Sample sizes for native students identifying themselves as "American Indians" and for minority transfers are too small to make any meaningful descriptive statements. (See Appendix B for breakout of performance data by ethnicity.)

Regardless of their eligibility or ethnic status, almost all students performed at acceptable levels. These findings are similar to those found in previous studies by the University.

PERSISTENCE AND GRADUATION RATES

Campus persistence and graduation rates reflect the complex interaction of many factors. Accordingly there is no one-to-one relationship between the rates to be presented here and a given policy, program, service, or student attribute. Some of the factors affecting these rates include a student's ability to accommodate campus demands, a campus' capacity to respond to the particular needs of each student, a student's reassessment of his or her career goals, and the number of Community College students who transfer to and from other University campuses. It should be noted that students admitted by Special Action do not meet regular admissions selection criteria for scholarship and academic performance. The basis on which they are admitted is campus specific, and their level of preparation will thus vary. Given that they have less than complete preparation for the University, one would expect that their persistence and graduation rates would be lower than those for regularly admitted

TABLE 17

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PERSISTENCE AND GRADUATION RATES
FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRANSFERS ADMITTED AS REGULAR SOPHOMORE

FALL 1982-85

Ethnicity/ Entering Class	Number Enrolled	% Persisting & Graduating After			% Graduating After	
		1Yr.	2Yrs.	3Yrs.	2Yrs.	3Yrs.
American Indian						
F '82	(5)	80.0	80.0	80.0	20.0	60.0
F '83	(10)	100.0	80.0		0.0	
F '84	(5)	80.0				
Asian						
F '82	(55)	78.2	58.2	49.1	0.0	16.4
F '83	(61)	82.0	72.1		3.3	
F '84	(66)	89.4				
Black						
F '82	(10)	80.0	80.0	70.0	10.0	40.0
F '83	(14)	78.6	71.4		0.0	
F '84	(12)	83.4				
Chicano						
F '82	(31)	80.7	67.8	58.1	0.0	35.5
F '83	(40)	77.5	75.0		10.0	
F '84	(43)	74.4				
Latino						
F '82	(20)	90.0	85.0	55.0	10.0	35.0
F '83	(22)	81.8	77.3		9.1	
F '84	(14)	71.4				
Pilipino						
F '82	(6)	66.7	66.7	66.7	0.0	50.0
F '83	(6)	83.3	83.4		16.7	
F '84	(12)	83.3				
White/Other						
F '82	(727)	78.1	69.2	63.8	11.4	47.1
F '83	(743)	79.5	68.1		11.4	
F '84	(668)	82.2				
All Students						
F '82	(800)*	69.4	65.8	62.6	10.2	44.3
F '83	(931)*	79.7	69.1		10.7	
F '84	(847)*	71.2				

Source: Office of the President, Admission and Outreach files, November 1987.

*These totals included cases with unknown ethnic identity.

TABLE 18
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PERSISTENCE AND GRADUATION RATES
FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRANSFERS ADMITTED AS SPECIAL ACTION SOPHOMORE
FALL 1982-85

Ethnicity/ Entering Class	Number Enrolled	<u>% Persisting & Graduating After</u>			<u>% Graduating After</u>	
		1Yr.	2Yrs.	3Yrs.	2Yrs.	3Yrs.
American Indian						
F '82	(6)	66.7	50.0	50.0	0.0	33.3
F '83	(9)	66.7	55.6		0.0	
F '84	(12)	66.7				
Asian						
F '82	(29)	86.2	72.4	44.8	0.0	17.2
F '83	(23)	82.6	65.2		0.0	
F '84	(17)	94.1				
Black						
F '82	(50)	68.0	42.0	34.0	4.0	10.0
F '83	(62)	72.6	53.2		1.6	
F '84	(48)	75.0				
Chicano						
F '82	(57)	66.7	57.9	59.6 ⁺	70.0	35.1
F '83	(60)	65.0	45.0		0.0	
F '84	(68)	69.1				
Latino						
F '82	(16)	87.5	62.5	62.5	6.2	31.2
F '83	(13)	92.3	92.3		0.0	
F '84	(31)	83.9				
Pilipino						
F '82	(8)	87.5	75.0	75.0	0.0	37.5
F '83	(7)	100.0	85.7		0.0	
F '84	(9)	66.7				
White/Other						
F '82	(265)	77.4	65.7	55.8	9.4	38.1
F '83	(265)	80.0	66.0		9.1	
F '84	(263)	78.3				
All Students						
F '82	(445)*	64.0	55.7	51.7	7.4	32.8
F '83	(451)*	77.2	62.3		6.2	
F '84	(460)*	77.0				

Source: Office of the President, Admission and Outreach files, November 1987.

*These totals included cases with unknown ethnic identity.

⁺Persistence percentages for each year are based on the total number of students who have earned a degree or are enrolled, including those who have returned to school. If more students return than leave (without graduation) in a given year, the persistence percent will be higher than that of the preceding year.

students.

In this section, persistence and graduation rates are expressed in percentage terms. It should be kept in mind that percentage changes over time are meaningful to the extent that they are based on a large number of cases. When sample sizes are small, percentage figures change dramatically and become less reliable estimates of the population characteristics to which they refer. Analysis of persistence and graduation data to be presented will be limited to third-year figures which provide a more reliable accounting than first- and second-year performances.

Tables 17 and 18 summarize persistence and graduation data for sophomore transfers entering the University Fall 1982-85. As would be expected, Regular Admits tend to do better than Special Action students. The percent of Fall 1982 sophomores who were persisting or who had graduated after three years was 62.6% for Regular Admits and 51.7% for Special Action Admits. The former compares favorably with third-year rates recently reported for regularly admitted native students at four University campuses which varied from 46-66% (4). The latter compares favorably with similar rates recently reported for specially admitted native students at seven University campuses which varied from 45-62% (4).

Among the regularly admitted group, 44.3% had obtained their degree by the end of the third year, and among the specially admitted group, 32.8% had graduated within this same period. The data for the relatively small number of underrepresented students suggests that the majority tend to persist through or graduate by their third year of study, regardless of admit status. The one exception was Special Admit Blacks. Whites had persistence and graduation rates slightly higher than what was true for all transfers as a group.

The performance of Asians transfers was different than what has been found for Asian freshmen. Among native students who enter the University as freshmen, Whites and Asians tend to have similar persistence and graduation rates. Apparently this is not the case for Community College Asian sophomore transfers. They were the only group for which the majority did not persist or graduate after three years, for both Regular and Special Action admits. One possible explanation for this finding is that Asians from the Community Colleges may be relatively recent immigrants who are still mastering the English language, and they tend to have substantive family responsibilities. Both of these factors, of course, would predispose many of these students to drop out and pursue employment.

Tables 19 and 20 summarize persistence and graduation data for junior transfers who entered the University Fall 1982-85. Regular Admits were again found to do better than Special Action students. The percent of Fall 1982 juniors who were persisting or who had graduated after three years was 57.4% for Regular Admits and 40.6% for Special Action Admits. While these rates are not high as those obtained for sophomores, the third-year

TABLE 19
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PERSISTENCE AND GRADUATION RATES
FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRANSFERS ADMITTED AS REGULAR JUNIOR

FALL 1982-85

Ethnicity/ Entering Class	Number Enrolled	<u>% Persisting & Graduating After</u>			<u>% Graduating After</u>		
		1Yr.	2Yrs.	3Yrs.	1Yr.	2Yrs.	3Yrs.
American Indian							
F '82	(14)	71.4	64.3	57.2	0.0	28.6	42.9
F '83	(15)	80.0	73.3		0.0	26.7	
F '84	(15)	73.3					
Asian							
F '82	(335)	84.8	60.9	52.8	0.0	14.0	41.8
F '83	(416)	88.9	73.6		0.0	15.9	
F '84	(396)	89.9			0.2		
Black							
F '82	(66)	80.3	62.1	45.4	0.0	13.6	36.4
F '83	(67)	80.6	56.7		0.0	13.4	
F '84	(52)	78.8			0.0		
Chicano							
F '82	(120)	83.3	67.5	64.2	0.0	27.5	54.1
F '83	(132)	85.6	68.9		0.0	18.2	
F '84	(128)	84.4			0.0		
Latino							
F '82	(67)	85.1	56.7	50.8	0.0	10.4	40.3
F '83	(82)	82.9	67.1		0.0	14.6	
F '84	(77)	81.8			0.0		
Pilipino							
F '82	(28)	71.4	46.4	35.7	0.0	7.1	35.7
F '83	(24)	83.3	54.2		0.0	4.2	
F '84	(37)	83.8			0.0		
White/Other							
F '82	(2101)	82.9	66.4	59.9	0.4	25.6	51.9
F '83	(2142)	85.5	70.8		0.0	25.1	
F '84	(2152)	85.4			0.0		
All Students							
F '82	(2840)*	69.8	60.2	57.4	0.3	23.6	49.9
F '83	(2982)*	70.3	64.4		0.2	22.7	
F '84	(2937)*	70.6			0.2		

Source: Office of the President, Admission and Outreach files, November 1987.

*These totals included cases with unknown ethnic identity.

TABLE 20

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PERSISTENCE AND GRADUATION RATES
FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRANSFERS ADMITTED AS SPECIAL ACTION JUNIOR

FALL 1982-85

Ethnicity/ Entering Class	Number Enrolled	% Persisting & Graduating After			% Graduating After	
		1Yr.	2Yrs.	3Yrs.	2Yrs.	3Yrs.
American Indian						
F '82	(3)	100.0	66.7	66.7	0.0	66.7
F '83	(2)	50.0	50.0			
F '84	(2)	100.0				
Asian						
F '82	(15)	66.7	66.7	26.7	0.0	20.0
F '83	(13)	84.6	84.6		7.7	
F '84	(16)	75.0				
Black						
F '82	(22)	90.9	68.2	40.9	9.1	31.8
F '83	(26)	73.1	61.5		7.7	
F '84	(20)	80.0				
Chicano						
F '82	(25)	88.0	60.0	32.0	0.0	16.0
F '83	(23)	87.0	73.9		13.0	
F '84	(43)	81.4			0.0	
Latino						
F '82	(8)	50.0	37.5	50.0 ⁺	0.0	37.5
F '83	(7)	71.4	42.9		14.3	
F '84	(11)	54.5			0.0	
Pilipino						
F '82	(5)	60.0	40.0	60.0 ⁺	0.0	0.0
F '83	(1)	100.0	100.0		0.0	
F '84	(2)	100.0				
White/Other						
F '82	(102)	73.5	58.8	48.0	20.6	41.2
F '83	(111)	82.0	69.4		23.4	
F '84	(145)	75.2				
Total						
F '82	(187)*	77.0	45.7	40.6	12.3	33.2
F '83	(187)*	80.2	68.4		17.6	
F '84	(247)*	76.5				

Source: Office of the President, Admission and Outreach files, November 1987.

*These totals included cases with unknown ethnic identity.

⁺Persistence percentages for each year are based on the total number of students who have earned a degree or are enrolled, including those who have returned to school. If more students return than leave (without graduation) in a given year, the persistence percent will be higher than that of the preceding year.

rates for Regular Admits still compare favorably with those of native students.

Among the regularly admitted group, 49.9% had obtained their degree by the end of the third year, and among the specially admitted group, 33.2% had graduated within this same period. The data for the relatively small number of underrepresented students suggests that the majority of regularly admitted Chicano and Latino students tend to persist through or graduate by their third year of study. Other generalizations concerning underrepresented students are not possible given the relatively small number of cases involved.

Whites, the largest group, had persistence and graduation rates slightly higher than the average of other groups; their rates compared favorably with the third-year rates of native students. The majority of Regular Admit Asians performed better than their sophomore counterparts, but their rates were still not comparable to those of Whites as would be expected. The rates of Special Action Asians, on the other hand, again suggest academic stress.

These findings suggest that the majority of Community College transfers persist or graduate, through their third-year of study, at rates that compare favorably with those of native students.

SUMMARY

This study updates and expands a previous one conducted by the Admissions and Outreach Services unit of the University. Reported statistics were organized around five topical areas: (1) Community College Transfer Trends, 1965-87; (2) Origins of Transfers; (3) Characteristics of Transfers; (4) First-Year Performance; and (5) Persistence and Graduation Rates.

Trend data reveals five intervals within the 1965-87 period which describe alternating increases and decreases in the number of transfers, with the period between 1986 and 1987 showing a 12% increase. Since the peak year of 1973, there has been an overall decrease in the number of transfers to the University. Since 1980, however, there has been a steady increase in the percent of high school graduates who enter the Community Colleges and who subsequently enter the University or the California State University.

The majority of Community College transfers come from Southern California and tend to enroll at University campuses close to their residence. A relatively small number of Community College campuses are responsible for these transfers. Since 1981, the top three University campuses which Community College transfers prefer are Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara; the two least preferred campuses are Riverside and Santa Cruz. Enrollment data on Fall 1986 transfers continue to suggest that Community College campuses with relatively high concentrations of underrepresented minorities tend to have fewer students who transfer to the University.

Most transfers enter the University as Regular Admits. More male than female transfers enroll as both Regular Admits and Special Action. Hispanic, Black, Pilipino, and American Indian students continue to be underrepresented at the University, whereas the number of Asian and White transfers exceed their proportional enrollment in the Community Colleges. Of the transfers who were admitted Fall 1986, 43% did not enroll. This reflects a 200% increase in no-shows, in spite of a 29.1% increase in the number of admitted students. Thirteen percent of no-shows were either Hispanic, Black, Pilipino, or American Indian.

During the Fall of 1985, the majority of transfers entered the University with a gpa of 3.0. This average is based on a substantial number of transferable units attempted and passed each semester, and achieved by a class which had a significant number of entrants who were not regularly admissable after high school because of subject and scholarship deficiencies. These findings suggest that University-bound transfers progress satisfactorily through their course work and that, for some students, the Community Colleges continue to provide the second chance envisioned by the authors of the Master Plan.

Transfers who entered the University Fall 1985 with upper division standing prefer majors in the social and biological sciences, and a significant percent entered with a general or unclassified status. More men than women major in engineering, business and management, mathematics, computer and information sciences, and the physical sciences. Women, on the other hand, elect majors in letters, psychology, interdisciplinary studies, and fine and applied arts more so than men. The percent of female and male transfers who elected majors in engineering, the biological and physical sciences showed an increase relative to Fall 1984 levels; whereas the percent who elected majors in computer and information sciences, interdisciplinary studies, mathematics, and the social sciences showed a decrease. These findings, of course, reflect available space and prevailing cultural norms regarding gender-specific occupational choices.

Fall 1985 regularly admitted transfers achieved a first-year gpa of 2.76. Within this group, 38.6% achieved a gpa of 3.0 or better, 65.4% achieved a gpa of 2.5 or greater, and 86.3% achieved a gpa of 2.0 or higher. Native students were found to achieve an upper division gpa that was higher than their lower division performance, whereas the opposite was the case for transfers from four-year institutions and the Community Colleges. Transfers who were eligible to the University upon graduation from high school performed better during their first year of upper-division work at the University than transfers who did not have this standing. Whites were found to perform better than Asians, and both of these groups performed better than other ethnic groups. Regardless of their origins, eligibility or ethnic status, almost all transfers performed at levels which are acceptable and which compare favorably with those of native students.

Third-year persistence and graduation rates for sophomore and junior transfers entering the University Fall 1982-85 was

reviewed. As expected, regularly admitted transfers tend to do better than those who are specially admitted for both groups of transfers. Third-year persistence and graduation rates for transfers compare favorable with what is the case for their native cohorts, with the rates for sophomore transfers being higher. Whites had rates which were higher than all other groups. The data for the relatively small number of underrepresented students suggests that the majority tend to persist through or graduate by their third-year of study. The one exception was Special Admit Black junior transfers, the majority of whom do not persist or graduate through their third-year. The performance of Asians was found to be less than what would be expected, and this finding may reflect the difficulty many recent Asian immigrants may be having in mastering the English language.

Overall this study finds that the majority of Community College students who transfer to the University are well prepared to succeed academically at the University. Statistics reviewed suggest further study as to why (1) the majority of Community College campuses continue to send relatively little or no transfers to the University; (2) a substantial number of transfers who are admitted elect not to enroll; (3) Hispanics, Black, American Indians, and Pilipinos continue to be underrepresented; (4) Special Admit Black junior transfers do not do well; and (5) the relative performance of Asian and White transfers is different than what has been found for Asian and White freshmen.

REFERENCES

1. Retention and Transfer. Report of the Task Group on Retention and Transfer, Office of the Academic Vice President, University of California. June, 1980.
2. A Profile of California Community College Transfer Students at the University of California. Admissions and Outreach Services, Office of the President, University of California. September, 1984.
3. The Transfer Center Project: A Progress Report. The California Community Colleges, the California State University, the University of California, and the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities. May, 1987.
4. Persistence and Graduation Rates for Regularly Admitted and Special Action Freshmen, 1979-84. Admissions and Outreach Services, Office of the President, University of California. May, 1987.

APPENDIX A

NEW FALL 1986 UNDERGRADUATE TRANSFERS FROM COMMUNITY COLLEGES

SCHOOL	UC CAMPUS AT WHICH ENROLLED								TOTAL
	SE	SV	IR	LA	RV	SO	SC	SD	
Alan Hancock College	3	1	2	4	0	11	1	2	24
American River C	13	57	4	10	2	5	8	5	134
Antelope Valley C	1	0	1	3	0	9	0	2	16
Bakersfield C	2	6	1	7	0	14	1	1	32
Barstow C	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Butte C	2	1	1	0	0	1	2	0	7
C of Alameda	20	7	0	2	0	3	1	2	35
C of Marin	29	11	1	6	0	10	9	2	68
C of San Mateo	30	14	2	6	2	17	8	4	83
C of the Canyons	0	1	2	10	0	2	0	0	15
C of the Desert	0	0	2	2	8	1	1	2	16
C of the Redwoods	1	2	0	0	0	1	3	0	7
C of the Sequoias	3	10	3	5	0	2	3	4	30
C of Stanislaus	0	4	0	3	1	0	1	0	9
Cabrille C	7	9	1	8	0	9	112	5	151
Canada C	11	2	0	1	1	2	4	0	21
Carrizo C	1	2	14	10	1	1	0	1	30
Carra Mesa Desert Campus									
Bakersfield	0	0	1	0	2	1	1	1	6
Chabot C	47	13	2	5	0	5	5	4	81
Chaffay C	0	0	6	0	11	4	1	4	26
Citrus C	1	0	7	7	6	3	1	1	26
City C of San Francisco	70	11	2	8	0	2	9	3	105
Coastline C	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
Columbia JC	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4
Compton C	0	0	1	3	0	0	2	0	6
Contra Costa C	19	3	0	1	0	2	1	0	24
Consumnes River C	4	8	0	0	0	4	0	1	17
Crafton Hills C	2	0	1	0	10	1	0	0	14
Cuesta C	2	2	3	3	0	7	3	2	22
Cuyamaca C	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Cypress C	3	0	20	7	3	4	0	2	39
De Anza C	30	19	6	14	1	30	23	0	139
Diablo Valley C	111	42	6	26	2	29	10	17	243
East Los Angeles C	10	1	7	14	1	0	1	1	35
El Camino C	9	6	24	65	4	20	1	14	143
Evergreen Valley C	4	7	1	0	0	2	4	2	20
Feather River C	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
Foothill C	31	10	3	15	0	20	19	13	117
Fresno City C	3	5	1	3	1	2	0	3	18
Fullerton JC	3	3	27	18	3	4	2	3	63
Gavilan C	0	2	0	2	0	2	7	1	14
Glendale C	5	1	9	24	1	8	0	7	55
Golden West C	3	2	39	12	2	3	4	3	68
Grossmont C	3	1	9	9	0	6	1	35	64
Hartnell C	2	3	1	3	1	3	11	4	28
Imperial Valley C	0	0	1	2	1	0	1	5	10
Indian Valley C	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
Kings River Comm Col	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	1	5
Lake Tahoe Com C	0	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	5
Laney C	31	7	0	3	0	3	8	1	53
Lassen C	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Long Beach City C	2	1	9	20	0	7	0	5	44
Los Angeles City C	2	1	3	36	1	1	1	1	46
Los Angeles Harbor C	0	1	5	10	1	1	0	1	19
Los Angeles Mission C	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	4
Los Angeles Pierce C	8	4	5	32	1	10	2	4	66
Los Angeles Southwest C	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	3
Los Angeles Trade Tech C	1	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	5
Los Angeles Valley C	4	3	1	48	1	5	2	3	67
Los Medanos C	5	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	8
Mendocino C	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
Merced C	1	2	2	1	1	2	0	0	9
Merriett C	32	3	0	2	0	0	1	0	38
Mira Costa C	0	0	2	1	1	2	2	20	28
Mission C	5	3	0	3	0	1	3	1	16

(continued)

APPENDIX A - (con't)

NEW FALL 1986 UNDERGRADUATE TRANSFERS FROM COMMUNITY COLLEGES

SCHOOL	UC CAMPUS AT WHICH ENROLLED								TOTAL
	BK	BV	IR	LA	RV	SB	SC	SD	
Modesto JC	4	9	0	3	0	3	3	1	23
Monterey Peninsula C	11	4	2	3	2	10	22	3	41
Reed Park C	3	0	7	9	0	45	0	4	48
Mount San Antonio C	1	0	13	17	2	5	2	5	51
Mount San Jacinto C	0	0	1	0	13	0	0	0	14
Hopa C	4	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	23
Ohlone C	13	3	3	0	1	5	5	3	33
Orange Coast C	16	2	115	44	2	20	4	4	207
Oxnard C	1	0	0	1	0	5	0	0	7
Palo Verde C	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Palomar C	4	1	10	8	3	6	2	34	70
Pasadena City C	13	4	22	32	5	17	0	10	123
Porterville C	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	4
Rio Honda C	0	1	12	6	2	0	0	3	24
Riverside City C	2	0	7	3	72	3	1	6	94
Sacramento City C	11	39	3	11	1	5	4	0	94
Saddleback C	3	4	73	17	6	19	0	10	132
Saddleback Com C	1	0	15	3	0	2	3	1	25
San Bernardino Valley C	0	0	0	0	16	0	2	3	21
San Diego City C	2	0	3	2	1	0	3	28	39
San Diego Mesa College	13	2	7	10	4	3	4	95	138
San Diego Miramar C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
San Joaquin Delta C	16	29	4	5	1	11	6	2	74
San Jose City C	5	1	0	4	2	2	1	0	15
Santa Ana C	0	1	31	4	2	5	1	0	44
Santa Barbara City C	11	3	5	11	0	187	7	3	227
Santa Monica C	19	4	16	165	1	27	6	15	253
Santa Rosa Junior C	22	28	2	6	0	22	5	5	90
Shasta C	0	17	1	0	0	2	1	0	21
Sierra College	9	16	1	2	0	4	4	0	36
Skyline C	8	4	0	2	0	0	3	0	17
Solano C	6	29	0	0	0	1	2	1	39
Southwestern C	0	0	2	2	1	1	0	30	36
Taft C	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	4
Ventura C	5	3	3	11	1	86	2	4	115
Victor Valley C	0	0	0	2	7	2	0	1	12
Vista College	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
West Los Angeles C	1	1	3	15	0	2	1	0	23
West Valley C	17	12	3	8	1	11	18	4	74
Yuba C	0	19	3	0	0	1	0	0	23
Total	798	617	611	915	226	810	396	488	4861

Source: University of California, Admissions and Outreach files, May 1986.

TABLE 1

COMPARISON OF THE 1985-86 ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF REGULARLY
ADMITTED FALL 1985 COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRANSFERS WITH
COHORTS WHO TRANSFERRED FROM FOUR-YEAR
INSTITUTIONS AND NATIVE FRESHMEN
WHO BECAME JUNIORS FALL 1982

Performance Level/ Units Completed as of Fall 1985	Fall 1983 Native Freshmen Who Became Juniors Fall 1985	Fall 1985 Junior Transfers from 4-Year Colleges		Fall 1985 Community College Junior Transfers	
		Eligible from High School	Ineligible High School	Eligible from High School	Ineligible High School
<u>Asians</u>					
Lower Division GPA					
75-89.9 (n)	2.86 (755)	3.27 (9)	3.21 (7)	3.28 (9)	3.21 (64)
90-100 (n)	2.99 (380)	3.14 (8)	3.50 (3)	3.35 (12)	3.23 (92)
100.1-120 (n)	3.20 (291)	3.27 (4)	3.44 (15)	3.32 (27)	3.30 (142)
First-Year Upper Division GPA					
75-89.9 (n) (Units Completed)	2.96 (687) (35.3)	2.83 (9) (28.6)	2.66 (7) (33.0)	2.61 (9) (32.2)	2.79 (64) (32.3)
90-100 (n) (Units Completed)	3.04 (339) (37.8)	3.00 (8) (38.9)	3.03 (3) (36.0)	2.80 (12) (32.4)	2.79 (92) (34.6)
100.1-120 (n) (Units Completed)	3.18 (263) (38.6)	2.95 (4) (32.0)	3.08 (15) (36.3)	3.04 (27) (37.8)	2.83 (142) (35.0)

TABLE 2

COMPARISON OF THE 1985-86 ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF REGULARLY
ADMITTED FALL 1985 COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRANSFERS WITH
COHORTS WHO TRANSFERRED FROM FOUR-YEAR
INSTITUTIONS AND NATIVE FRESHMEN
WHO BECAME JUNIORS FALL 1982

Performance Level/ Units Completed as of Fall 1985	Fall 1983 Native Freshmen Who Became Juniors Fall 1985	Fall 1985 Junior Transfers from 4-Year Colleges		Fall 1985 Community College Junior Transfers	
		Eligible from High school	Ineligible High School	Eligible from High School	Ineligible High School
<u>White</u>					
Lower Division GPA					
75-89.9	2.83	3.17	3.05	3.28	3.10
(n)	(2910)	(27)	(55)	(57)	(402)
90-100	3.03	3.25	3.01	3.27	3.14
(n)	(1956)	(40)	(60)	(85)	(355)
100.1-120	3.18	3.36	2.97	3.43	3.16
(n)	(1212)	(28)	(48)	(98)	(379)
First-Year Upper Division GPA					
75-89.9	2.94	3.20	2.71	2.91	2.67
(n)	(2616)	(27)	(55)	(57)	(402)
(Units Completed)	(35.6)	(36.3)	(30.7)	(40.3)	(31.8)
90-100	3.11	3.06	2.85	2.93	2.83
(n)	(1735)	(40)	(60)	(85)	(353)
(Units Completed)	(37.6)	(40.7)	(35.3)	(37.7)	(34.1)
100.1-120	3.23	3.18	2.90	3.09	2.93
(n)	(1070)	(28)	(48)	(98)	(379)
(Units Completed)	(38.1)	(41.9)	(32.6)	(36.7)	(33.3)

Source: Office of the President, Admissions and Outreach files, November 1987.

TABLE 3

COMPARISON OF THE 1985-86 ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF REGULARLY
ADMITTED FALL 1985 COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRANSFERS WITH
COHORTS WHO TRANSFERRED FROM FOUR-YEAR
INSTITUTIONS AND NATIVE FRESHMEN
WHO BECAME JUNIORS FALL 1982

Performance Level/ Units Completed as of Fall 1985	Fall 1983 Native Freshmen Who Became Juniors Fall 1985	Fall 1985 Junior Transfers from 4-Year Colleges		Fall 1985 Community College Junior Transfers	
		Eligible from High school	Ineligible High School	Eligible from High School	Ineligible High School
<u>Latino</u>					
Lower Division GPA					
75-89.9 (n)	2.68 (84)	(0)	2.85 (2)	2.87 (3)	3.01 (15)
90-100 (n)	3.07 (38)	3.29 (2)	(0)	2.97 (4)	2.98 (14)
100.1-120 (n)	3.02 (30)	2.76 (2)	2.75 (5)	3.03 (5)	3.05 (22)
First-Year Upper Division GPA					
75-89.9 (n) (Units Completed)	2.78 (77) (35.0)	(0)	2.26 (2) (36.0)	2.54 (3) (42.7)	2.46 (15) (29.4)
90-100 (n) (Units Completed)	3.12 (35) (36.6)	2.40 (2) (29.5)	(0)	2.64 (4) (40.2)	2.52 (14) (33.2)
100.1-120 (n) (Units Completed)	3.08 (26) (40.4)	2.74 (2) (44.0)	2.51 (5) (29.6)	2.78 (5) (48.0)	2.77 (22) (33.3)

TABLE 4

COMPARISON OF THE 1985-86 ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF REGULARLY
ADMITTED FALL 1985 COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRANSFERS WITH
COHORTS WHO TRANSFERRED FROM FOUR-YEAR
INSTITUTIONS AND NATIVE FRESHMEN
WHO BECAME JUNIORS FALL 1982

Performance Level/ Units Completed as of Fall 1985	Fall 1983 Native Freshmen Who Became Juniors Fall 1985	Fall 1985 Junior Transfers from 4-Year Colleges		Fall 1985 Community College Junior Transfers	
		Eligible from High school	Ineligible High School	Eligible from High School	Ineligible High School
<u>Chicano</u>					
Lower Division GPA					
75-89.9 (n)	2.65 (187)	2.58 (1)	2.85 (1)	3.27 (6)	3.00 (35)
90-100 (n)	3.84 (64)	3.63 (1)	2.59 (6)	3.68 (3)	2.90 (34)
100.1-120 (n)	2.97 (37)	3.13 (1)	2.79 (5)	3.10 (11)	2.96 (34)
First-Year Upper Division GPA					
75-89.9 (n) (Units Completed)	2.72 (173) (34.7)	1.91 (1) (25.0)	2.71 (1) (28.0)	2.79 (6) (29.8)	2.46 (35) (33.6)
90-100 (n) (Units Completed)	2.88 (59) (36.1)	3.00 (1) (37.0)	2.00 (6) (22.8)	2.98 (3) (35.3)	2.42 (34) (33.4)
100.1-120 (n) (Units Completed)	3.02 (33) (37.8)	3.16 (1) (114.3)	2.78 (5) (33.5)	2.56 (11) (32.2)	2.50 (34) (34.9)

Source: Office of the President, Admissions and Outreach files, November 1987.

TABLE 5

COMPARISON OF THE 1985-86 ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF REGULARLY
ADMITTED FALL 1985 COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRANSFERS WITH
COHORTS WHO TRANSFERRED FROM FOUR-YEAR
INSTITUTIONS AND NATIVE FRESHMEN
WHO BECAME JUNIORS FALL 1982

Performance Level/ Units Completed as of Fall 1985	Fall 1983 Native Freshmen Who Became Juniors Fall 1985	Fall 1985 Junior Transfers from 4-Year Colleges		Fall 1985 Community College Junior Transfers	
		Eligible from High school	Ineligible High School	Eligible from High School	Ineligible High School
<u>Black</u>					
Lower Division GPA					
75-89.9 (n)	2.60 (136)	2.96 (2)	2.77 (5)	(0)	2.95 (11)
90-100 (n)	2.77 (38)	(0)	2.54 (3)	(0)	2.84 (17)
100.1-120 (n)	2.82 (10)	(0)	2.76 (4)	(0)	2.85 (14)
First-Year Upper Division GPA					
75-89.9 (n) (Units Completed)	2.62 (130) (35.0)	2.95 (2) (37.5)	2.69 (5) (31.4)	(0)	2.26 (11) (30.5)
90-100 (n) (Units Completed)	2.84 (35) (36.8)	(0)	2.38 (3) (21.3)	(0)	2.32 (17) (28.2)
100.1-120 (n) (Units Completed)	2.56 (7) (34.4)	(0)	1.85 (4) (23.7)	(0)	2.19 (14) (29.9)

Source: Office of the President, Admissions and Outreach files, November 1987.

TABLE 6

COMPARISON OF THE 1985-86 ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF REGULARLY
ADMITTED FALL 1985 COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRANSFERS WITH
COHORTS WHO TRANSFERRED FROM FOUR-YEAR
INSTITUTIONS AND NATIVE FRESHMEN
WHO BECAME JUNIORS FALL 1982

Performance Level/ Units Completed as of Fall 1985	Fall 1983 Native Freshmen Who Became Juniors Fall 1985	Fall 1985 Junior Transfers from 4-Year Colleges		Fall 1985 Community College Junior Transfers	
		Eligible from High school	Ineligible High School	Eligible from High School	Ineligible High School
<u>Pilipino</u>					
Lower Division GPA					
75-89.9 (n)	2.66 (146)	2.88 (2)	2.99 (1)	3.65 (3)	2.78 (6)
90-100 (n)	2.84 (41)	(0)	2.96 (2)	3.29 (1)	2.84 (8)
100.1-120 (n)	3.01 (32)	(0)	2.62 (2)	3.30 (3)	3.10 (8)
First-Year Upper Division GPA					
75-89.9 (n) (Units Completed)	2.77 (142) (34.9)	2.72 (2) (29.0)	2.97 (1) (35.0)	3.24 (3) (31.3)	2.34 (6) (27.8)
90-100 (n) (Units Completed)	2.88 (40) (39.9)	(0)	1.95 (2) (22.0)	2.80 (1) (33.0)	2.12 (8) (34.9)
100.1-120 (n) (Units Completed)	3.14 (28) (40.1)	(0)	2.38 (2) (17.5)	2.87 (5) (41.0)	2.44 (8) (35.0)

Source: Office of the President, Admissions and Outreach files, November 1987.

TABLE 7

COMPARISON OF THE 1985-86 ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF REGULARLY
ADMITTED FALL 1985 COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRANSFERS WITH
COHORTS WHO TRANSFERRED FROM FOUR-YEAR
INSTITUTIONS AND NATIVE FRESHMEN
WHO BECAME JUNIORS FALL 1982

Performance Level/ Units Completed as of Fall 1985	Fall 1983 Native Freshmen Who Became Juniors Fall 1985	Fall 1985 Junior Transfers from 4-Year Colleges		Fall 1985 Community College Junior Transfers	
		Eligible from High school	Ineligible High School	Eligible from High School	Ineligible High School
<u>American Indian</u>					
Lower Division GPA					
75-89.9	2.81			3.29	2.97
(n)	(16)	(0)	(0)	(1)	(3)
90-100	3.09				2.99
(n)	(3)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(6)
100.1-120	3.14		3.38	3.64	2.80
(n)	(6)	(0)	(0)	(1)	(5)
First-Year Upper Division GPA					
75-89.9	2.84			3.24	3.03
(n)	(14)	(0)	(0)	(1)	(3)
(Units Completed)	(36.6)		(36.0)	(32.0)	(27.8)
90-100	3.70				2.73
(n)	(3)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(6)
(Units Completed)	(34.2)				(24.8)
100.1-120	3.22		3.61	2.64	2.93
(n)	(5)	(0)	(1)	(1)	(5)
(Units Completed)	(36.6)		(34.0)	(38.0)	(24.0)

Source: Office of the President, Admissions and Outreach files, November 1987.

Appendix C

ORIGINAL AND CORRECTED FIGURES FOR TABLE 10 FROM 1984 REPORT ON COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRANSFERS TO THE UNIVERSITY

TABLE 10, ORIGINAL

	Native Freshmen Who Became Juniors	Transfers from 4-year Colleges	Community College Transfers	
			Eligible from High School	Ineligible from High School
Lower Division Grades	3.03	3.11	3.32	3.18
First Year Upper Division Grades	2.96	2.69	2.92	2.67

TABLE 10, CORRECTED

	Native Freshmen Who Became Juniors	Transfers from 4-year Colleges	Community College Transfers	
			Eligible from High School	Ineligible from High School
Lower Division Grades	3.04	3.12	3.33	3.14
First Year Upper Division Grades	3.11	2.86	2.88	2.72

Source: University of California, Office of the President, Admissions and Outreach files, May 1986.